



-----  
Date: Thu, 7 Jan 1993 17:57:05 GMT  
From: swrinde!gatech!ee.gatech.edu!fisher.eedsp.gatech.edu!tucker@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: County Hunter reports  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1ifjbpINNt83@master.cs.rose-hulman.edu> derry@NeXtwork.Rose-Hulman.Edu  
(John Derry) writes:

>  
>Could someone post the reports that county hunters use? I've heard  
>"threes" and such and would like to know what reports they use and what  
>they mean.

I've run counties a few times on the MARAC net on 14.336. The conventions  
they use are kind of silly, but it's an enjoyable way to pass interstate  
driving hours, so I'm not complaining.

Here's what I've heard used there:

59 -- Maximum (shouldn't have to use that)  
57  
55 -- Nickels or speed limit  
33 -- Triplets  
22 -- Minimum

I think that 90% of reports are just these five RST's with an occasional  
56 or 58 thrown in.

Just for completeness sake, I'll throw in some more information about  
the 14336 net. All contacts on that net are monitored by a net control.  
Each station must acknowledge and repeat the report given to it. So,  
an exchange might go like:

Mobile: QRZ  
County Hunter: W4DOC  
Mobile: W4DOC you're 55  
County Hunter: Thanks for the 55, you're 33 33 triplets  
Mobile: Got the triplets, QRZ?

Most people who run mobile on this net register with the Mobile QSL  
Bureau. This is a QSL bureau run by the county hunters to hold down  
costs and make things easy for the mobiles. If you're good in the  
Callbook, just tell net control. Otherwise, give NCS your mailing  
address. After running mobile, you can expect a mailing from the  
QSL bureau. They will send you several ham's MRC's or Mobile reply  
cards. These are essentially pre-made QSL's from you to them. You

just sign and send back. You will also get QSL's from the stations and they appreciate your pretty QSL's too if you want.

Running counties is a fun way to pass the time on the road. Note that on this net, anyway, only mobile stations are allowed to put out a county. Fixed stations can only call other counties. If you're mobile and you answer another station putting out a county, you typically give your county with the report, in case the other guy is a county hunter.

73 de Jeff

--

-----  
Jeff Tucker  
tucker@eedsp.gatech.edu  
W4AQL Contest Domination Team

N9HZQ, EMT-A  
Graduate Student, Electrical Engineering  
Georgia Institute of Technology

-----  
Date: 7 Jan 93 17:25:59 GMT  
From: att-out!cbfsb!cbnewsb.cb.att.com!wb2qoq@RUTGERS.EDU  
Subject: Dayton Hamfest Camping  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I am looking for campground suggestions from anyone who has camped in the Daytonarea for the Hamvention. The last time (1991) my wife and I camped in our 20 ft.trailer at the Enon Beach campground, approx. 20 miles east of Dayton, right off of Rt.70, near Springfield. It was sort of a run down campground, sites were close together. I am thinking about making reservations at a campground for this years Hamvention. Are there any recommended campgrounds from readers of this newsgroup.

TNX Rick Anderson WB2QOQ (please e-mail to rja@zeppo.att.com)

-----  
Date: Thu, 7 Jan 1993 18:24:40 GMT  
From: sdd.hp.com!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!rpi!root@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: DRAKE TR-7(A) XCVR  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Has anybody out there owned or used the Drake TR-7(A) xvcrr???

I'd like to know it's good and bad points & How would it compare in performance to rigs like the Icom 751A & Kenwood TS-830s..

Any comments would be appreciated...

thanks,

-----  
Email: root@june.cmp.rpi.edu  
Jeff Ordon WV2N  
-----

Date: 7 Jan 1993 12:44:15 -0600  
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!tamsun.tamu.edu!tamsun.tamu.edu!news@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Exam dates?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Can someone please post upcoming exam dates? In particular, I'm interested in sessions in or near Austin, Tx.

Thanks a lot,

Brandon  
KB5WDR  
-----

Date: Thu, 07 Jan 93 18:39:38 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!paladin.american.edu!darwin.sura.net!  
mojo.eng.umd.edu!chuck@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Morality vs. THE LAW  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <9301062036.AA25759@tecnet1.jcte.jcs.mil> mgb@tecnet1.jcte.jcs.mil writes:

... A bunch of stuff about courteous ham behavior, and closed repeaters...

>There are GIVERS... and there are TAKERS... there are NICE PEOPLE and

The problem is that there are a large number of us folks that consider operators of closed "vanity" repeaters to be "TAKERS" of our public frequencies.

We would much rather that these closed "vanity" repeaters be on shared frequency pairs, so as to free up space for other more effective public uses.

>there are ASSHOLES. I personally would like to be remembered as a nice

Remember! Nice people don't call other people "assholes".

73,

Chuck Harris - WA3UQV  
chuck@eng.umd.edu

-----  
Date: 7 Jan 93 17:00:52 GMT  
From: swrinde!gatech!prism!ccoprfrfm@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: New ACC mailing list ready to go  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hello,

After much wating on my end, the Advanced Computer Controlls discussion list is finally ready to go.

It is being hosted by the listserver on our IBM ES/9000 here at Georgia Tech. To subscribe to the list, simply send a mail message to:

listserv@gitvm1.gatech.edu

in the body of the message, just say:

subscribe acc-l

That's it. You should then be subscribed to the list.

To post messages to the list, send your mail message to:

acc-l@gitvm1.gatech.edu

If you have any problems getting any of this to work, then you can send me mail and I'll try to help out. I'm the list owner, so any questions/comments/concerns should be directed to me.

Enjoy,

--  
Monte Freeman -- Operations Department / Information Technology  
Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta Georgia, 30332  
Internet: ccoprfrfm@prism.gatech.edu  
Bitnet: ccoprfrfm@gitvm1.bitnet

-----  
Date: Thu, 7 Jan 1993 17:05:32 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!spool.mu.edu!enterpoop.mit.edu!linus!  
linus.mitre.org!mwvm.mitre.org!m14494@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: On private repeaters  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

This subject surfaces every few years, and becomes a Big Issue for a while. Here's my \$ 2e-2 worth:

Repeaters are private property, and are used by the general ham population only with the permission of the owner. However, there is no such thing as a private frequency; all ham frequencies belong to all hams, all the time. Repeater coordination is a voluntary gentleman's (and woman's) agreement to avoid the input and output frequencies so as to allow the repeater operator to better serve the needs of the amateur community. The holder of a coordinated freq is, I feel, a steward of the frequency, and has an obligation to use it in a way that supports and betters the local amateur population. If an operator want's to have a private repeater, that's fine with me; I certainly have no right to use his repeater against his will. In that case, however, I feel he has abrogated his end of the gentleman's agreement, and I am free to use the repeater frequencies for my own purposes, subject only to the rules and customs about interference; in other words, when the closed repeater is not actually on the air, the freqs are fair game. If I'm using the freq, in my opinion the closed repeater users have to wait till I'm done before they key up; they have no right to ask me to reserve the frequency for their exclusive use.

Just one hams opinion...

Mike, N4PDY

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* These are my opinions only.\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

-----

Date: Thu, 7 Jan 1993 18:06:31 GMT  
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!hermes.chpc.utexas.edu!news.utdallas.edu!corpgate!brtph560!brtph87!tcain@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Periphex :-)  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <9301061933.AA15289@ucsd.edu> FLEM%athena@leia.polaroid.COM (SKIP FLEM, NT1G, 14X17 NEWTON-1M 617-630-4482) writes:  
>>Needless to say, I will never purchase another (Periphex HT battery) and  
>recommend the same to you.  
> My experiance with Periphex was just as disappointing as yours. We needed

Oh well, I've purchased several Icom inserts as well as new batteries from Periphex and have never had a problem. I'll continue to buy all my new batteries from them.

Tom, WB80UE

--

Tom Cain WB80UE

tcain@bnr.ca

disclaimer: i don't speak for nobody!

-----

Date: 7 Jan 93 16:02:27 GMT

From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!rphroy!link.ph.gmr.com!

vbreaault@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: WANTED: Repeater controller comments

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jan7.063839.21791@random.ccs.northeastern.edu>  
acm139@ccs.northeastern.edu (Scott Ehrlich) writes:

I am looking for USER REPORTS on the Computer Automated Technology CAT-1000 Repeater Controller.

I am primarily interested in the areas of Durability, Service problems, etc.

Also, if you have comments/suggestions/recommendations for any other repeater controller, please let me know, too.

The budget is under \$1000.

Thanks much in advance!

```
=====
| Scott Ehrlich           Internet: wylz@splinter.coe.northeastern.edu |
| Amateur Radio: wylz     Packet Radio: wylz@k1ugm.ma.usa.na
|
=====
```

The General Motors Amateur Radio Club recently put up a 440 repeater using a Kenwood repeater and a CAT-1000 controller. In fact, we took delivery of the first CAT-1000 produced. As such, we were involved with some of the initial design and implementation work.

It had a few problems early on, but the CAT folks were attentive and prompt. Firmware upgrades were reliable and none had to be backed out. The hardware has never given us any trouble. The firmware (after the initial couple of releases) has performed flawlessly.

Just last night we installed the latest level of firmware in order to

take advantage of some new features that CAT has written.

All in all.... a fine controller.

If you have more questions or desire some specific information, I'll be glad to forward them to our technical support folks.

--

-val-

Val Breault - GM Research - vbreault@gmr.com - N80EF  
Instrumentation dept., 30500 Mound Rd., Warren, MI 48090-9055  
The opinions expressed by the author do not necessarily reflect  
those of GMR or those of the General Motors Corporation.

\\ /|  
\\ / |  
\\ /\_\_|  
\\ / |\_\_

-----  
Date: Wed, 06 Jan 93 19:01:44 GMT

From: usc!rpi!uwm.edu!linac!att!mcdchg!laidbak!tellab5!balr!ttd.teradyne.com!  
news@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan5.085312.22208@ringer.cs.utsa.edu>,  
<1993Jan5.161735.17871@ke4zv.uucp>, <1icp0aINNmiv@transfer.stratus.com>  
Subject : <None>

In article <1icp0aINNmiv@transfer.stratus.com>, fms@sw.stratus.com (Faith Senie)  
writes:

>>

>

> What does one reply to a SWL card? I got one recently, and didn't realize  
> that some sort of reply was appreciated. Just a note saying thanks? or is  
> there something more that should be done? I'd hate to leave the guy hanging  
> if he's expecting some sort of reply...

>

> 73 de Faith N1JIT

The normal response to an SWL card would be to check you log to verify that  
you had indeed been on the air at the time/freq/date that the SWL reported.  
Then respond with a QSL card, with the card marked up to indicate that  
you are confirming the SWL report of your operation on that freq/time/date.

Many SWLs belong to clubs and organizations that provide certificates for  
conformations a'la DXCC WAS, etc. The QSLs received qualify them for these  
awards.

If you were not on the air at that time/date then it's up to you if you want



to send a negative response, or none at all.

I seem to recall, too, that in the past the USSR ham liscensing path required certain SWL activity as a part of the path to a ham ticket, but that's an old memory and may be 'fuzzy' :-).

-----

John Rice - K9IJ		"Did I say that ?" I must have, but It was
rice@ttd.teradyne.com		MY opinion only, no one else's...Especially
(708)-940-9000 - (work)		Not my Employer's.... Licensed since 1959
(708)-438-5065 - (bbs )		Ex: K8YZR, KH6GHC, WB9CSP, W9MMB, WA1TXV

-----

Date: 7 Jan 1993 16:03:17 GMT  
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!tamsun.tamu.edu!cs.tamu.edu!kurt@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <eNTRwB1w164w@ham.almanac.bc.ca>,  
<1993Jan4.144520.19597@ultb.isc.rit.edu>, <1993Jan6.093218.27598@qualcomm.com>  
Subject : Re: Who do repeater coordinators represent?

In article <1993Jan6.093218.27598@qualcomm.com>, karn@servo.qualcomm.com (Phil Karn) writes:

|>  
|> Deja vu warning...  
|>  
|> I happen to agree with this. Using repeaters to reduce collisions  
|> \*does\* involve a significant opportunity cost. Unfortunately, the  
|> alternative techniques to "do it right" are still not yet known in the  
|> amateur service. These include:  
|>

[List of high bell-and-whistle index stuff deleted]

Damn, Phil, we're still at the stage where folks are trying to get their TNCs hooked up to their YeaHoo HTs!!! C'mon now!

[FTHI:8-}]

kf

--

Kurt Freiburger, wb5bbw kurt@cs.tamu.edu 409/847-8607 fax:409/847-8578  
Dept. of Computer Science, Texas A&M University DoD #264: BMW R80/7 pilot  
"We preserve our freedom using three boxes: ballot, jury, and cartridge."  
\*\*\* Not an official document of Texas A&M University \*\*\*

-----  
Date: 7 Jan 1993 16:45:11 GMT  
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!bcm!lib!oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu!jmaynard@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <lidghsINN1pa@transfer.stratus.com>, <8355@lib.tmc.edu>,  
<lifo38INNqah@transfer.stratus.com>  
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters

[Followups to .policy.]  
In article <lifo38INNqah@transfer.stratus.com> leadfoot@bigbootay.sw.stratus.com  
(Mark Curtis) writes:  
>Require PL/CTCSS on all machines, TX and RX, on 144, 220, and 440.  
>Add a warning that 10, 6, 900, and 1280 machines may in the future  
>require the same.

So far, so good. Some screaming will be heard, and some folks will refuse to  
go along. What then?

>Allow multiple repeaters on these low usage closed pairs.

We allow multiple repeaters on any pair, if the trustees agree.  
If you mean forcing folks to accept other repeaters on those pairs, though...

>If they scream, tough, the coordinator never owned the frequencies anyway.

OK...so what when they sue? Even if you're right, there's still the major  
expense and hassle of defending such a suit. Are you willing to pay that?

>Only coordinate high level/high power repeaters if they agree  
>to allow ANY user to use the basic repeat function of the machine.  
>They don't have to allow Phone Patch/DVR/Linking/etc., just the basic  
>TX on the input and RX on the output.

Value judgment. Again, what happens when the person sues? No coordinator is  
going to voluntarily impoverish himself; if the choice is between making a  
decision like this based on some arbitrary criterion and having to defend it  
in court, and tossing out the criterion and sticking with one that's  
objectively fair, guess which he'll do?

>Great examples of these kinds of machines here are 224.180- (KU6V) and  
>1286.0- (KJ6NN). Both of these machines have great coverage and are  
>open to all for the basic repeater function. After that if you want  
>access to more functions you have to talk to the trustee. Both are great  
>machines with very reasonable owners, too bad there aren't more people  
>like this.

That's wonderful, and I'm glad that KU6V and KJ6NN (isn't he on here?) choose to run their repeaters that way.

That doesn't mean that I think coordinators will be able to force others to do so. You apparently have an overinflated idea of the power of a coordinator; there's not a lot there beyond saying "if you operate on this frequency, and within these limits, we won't tell anyone else to operate there, and we will tell the FCC that we told you to operate here if they ask."

>|> The folks you're now complaining about were told the exact same thing about 2  
>|> meters then: There isn't room for you on here. Go to 440 if you want to do  
>|> that.

>|> Now that dual-band rigs are getting popular, you want to change the rules on  
>|> them. Is that fair?

>Who said life was fair? Grow up! The coordinator at that time didn't  
>think about the future and growth. So now he has to admit he was  
>short sighted and get on with fixing the mistake. No big deal, happens  
>all the time.

No big deal to you, maybe; you won't have to defend the lawsuit that'll happen when he tries to, in your words, "fix the mistake". Have you ever been there? I have. It's not something I would go seek out, yet that's exactly what you're demanding that the coordinators do.

I agree that life isn't necessarily fair, but going out of your way to make it unfair usually isn't a good idea.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can  
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"Science is all in the public domain, and allows few secrets."

-- Tom Clancy, The Sum of All Fears

-----  
Date: 7 Jan 1993 16:46:18 GMT

From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!bcm!lib!oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu!jmaynard@network.UCSD.EDU

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1idghsINN1pa@transfer.stratus.com>, <8355@lib.tmc.edu>,  
<1igfa7INNqoi@network.ucsd.edu>

Subject : Re: Closed repeaters

In article <1igfa7INNqoi@network.ucsd.edu> brian@ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor) writes:

>Jay, you're from Texas; you know that the best way to handle assbites  
>like these is to shoot them. Cheaper, too.

"Assassination is only a momentary pleasure, and is bound to get you talked about." (Name that reference.)

Still, I could use some target practice...

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can  
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"Science is all in the public domain, and allows few secrets."

-- Tom Clancy, \_The Sum of All Fears\_

-----

Date: 7 Jan 1993 16:10:43 GMT

From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!tamsun.tamu.edu!cs.tamu.edu!kurt@network.UCSD.EDU

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1idghsINN1pa@transfer.stratus.com>, <8355@lib.tmc.edu>,  
<1igfa7INNqoi@network.ucsd.edu>

Subject : Re: Closed repeaters

In article <1igfa7INNqoi@network.ucsd.edu>, brian@ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor) writes:

|> Jay, you're from Texas; you know that the best way to handle assbites

|> like these is to shoot them. Cheaper, too.

|>

|> For the rest of us:

|> This argument has once again gotten beyond reason; either take it to

|> the street or shut up.

|> - Brian

As a wise man said: "Killing someone is only a momentary pleasure, and it's  
bound to get you talked about." Lazarus Long/Robert Heinlein

--

Kurt Freiburger, wb5bbw kurt@cs.tamu.edu 409/847-8607 fax:409/847-8578

Dept. of Computer Science, Texas A&M University DoD #264: BMW R80/7 pilot

"We preserve our freedom using three boxes: ballot, jury, and cartridge."

\*\*\* Not an official document of Texas A&M University \*\*\*

-----

Date: Wed, 06 Jan 1993 23:42:45 GMT

From: nwnexus!jhgrud!eskimo!ssc!tad@uunet.uu.net

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1992Dec30.234200.11309@ke4zv.uucp>, <1993Jan02.061145.6961@ssc.com>,  
<1993Jan3.184611.5834@ke4zv.uucp>1

Subject : Re: 430mhz band under th

In article <1993Jan3.184611.5834@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)  
writes:

>In article <1993Jan02.061145.6961@ssc.com> tad@ssc.com (Tad Cook) writes:

>>In article <1992Dec30.234200.11309@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>>>In article <1992Dec30.062020.24365@ssc.com> tad@ssc.com (Tad Cook) writes:

>>>>

>>>>Maybe the following has some bearing here:

>>>>

>>>>97.205 Repeater station.

>>>>

>>>> (c) Where the transmissions of a repeater cause harmful  
>>>>interference to another repeater, the two station licensees are  
>>>>equally and fully responsible for resolving the interference UNLESS  
>>>>THE OPERATION OF ONE STATION IS RECOMMENDED BY A FREQUENCY  
>>>>COORDINATOR AND THE OPERATION OF THE OTHER STATION IS NOT. In that  
>>>>case, the licensee of the non-coordinated repeater has primary  
>>>>responsibility to resolve the interference.

>>>> (d) A repeater may be automatically controlled.

>>>> (e) Ancillary functions of a repeater that are available to  
>>>>users on the input channel are not considered remotely controlled  
>>>>functions of the station. LIMITING THE USE OF A REPEATER TO ONLY  
>>>>CERTAIN USER STATIONS IS PERMISSIBLE.

>>>>

>>>>(CAPITALIZED EMPHASIS IS MINE)

>>>>

>>>Two things to note here. First, section (c) only applies to interference  
>>>from one repeater to another repeater and says nothing about individual  
>>>non-repeater station transmissions.

>>

>>Ha! Please test this for us. Start operating simplex packet on  
>>the input of a local repeater. See if citing this rule does you any  
>>good at all.

>>

>>It won't.

>

>You have that backwards, it won't do \*you\*, the repeater owner, any  
>good because it only refers to interference between \*repeater\* stations.  
>The applicable regulation for the case you state is 97.101(b) which  
>says "No frequency will be assigned for the exclusive use of any station."  
>As long as there is no \*on going\* QSO on the repeater that suffers  
>interference by the simplex use, the simplex user is not in violation.  
>Someone who comes on and attempts to "talk over" the packet transmission  
>\*would\* be in violation for malicious interference.

So a repeater has NO defense against a jammer who sets up a packet station on its freq? The packet TNC will not transmit when there is a signal present, so you are saying that the repeater user who attempts to talk on the repeater at any time after the jamming TNC has been set up could be cited because he is talking over the "simplex user"??

Please try this and then report back how well it works.

As someone else noted,  
>transmitting simplex on a repeater input is inconvenient because to remain  
>legal, the repeater output would also have to be monitored \*first\* to see if  
>there is possible interference to an \*on going\* QSO through the repeater.  
>Operating simplex on the output frequency is a better practice, but  
>operating on the input is \*not\* a violation if the repeater is not  
>otherwise in use at the time of commencement of simplex operation.

Then how have operators of links-closed repeaters-packet forwarding  
networks been able to deal with miscreants all these years?  
Why doesn't your argument work then for the folks who like to  
torment repeater owners in LA?

>  
>> Second, section (e) refers to  
>>>\*ancillary\* functions of repeaters and the ability to limit access to  
>>>those \*ancillary\* functions to certain user stations. This doesn't  
>>>address closed repeaters where the \*primary\* function of the repeater  
>>>is restricted.  
>>>  
>>  
>>  
>>You're confused. The ability of a licensee to limit access to  
>>his station is NOT confined to ancillary functions.  
>  
>No, I'm not confused. It's true that a repeater operator can \*always\*  
>vacate the frequency occupied by his repeater by turning it \*off\*  
>when he doesn't want it to repeat a particular amateur's transmissions.  
>But that's a separate issue. The right to \*cease operations\* is never  
>questioned anywhere in the regulations. What the repeater operator  
>\*cannot\* do is lay exclusive claim to any frequency by attempting to  
>prohibit \*any\* licensed operator from transmitting on a frequency  
>that is currently not in use.  
>

Sorry.....if this were true, then coordinators would not be able  
to coordinate, operators of any kind of link or repeater would  
have no defense against idiots who want to torment them.

--

Tad Cook | Phone: 206-527-4089 (home) | MCI Mail: 3288544

Seattle, WA | Packet: KT7H @ N7DUO.WA.USA.NA | 3288544@mcimail.com  
| Internet: tad@ssc.com or...sumax!ole!ssc!tad

-----  
End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #33  
\*\*\*\*\*